DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 741 HE 002 543

AUTHOR Mortimer, Kenneth P.; Leslie, David W.

TITLE The Academic Senate at The Pennsylvania State University.

INSTITUTION Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Center for the Study of Higher Education.

PUB DATE Aug 71

NOTE 83p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29

DESCRIPTORS Faculty; *Faculty Organizations; *Governance; *Higher Education; *Organization; *Power Structure

IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania State University Academic Senate

ABSTRACT

This report is a case study of the Academic Senate at The Pennsylvania State University, and is based on the Senate's organization and functioning from 1966 through 1970. In late 1970, the Academic Senate ceased to exist and the new University Faculty Senate was created. Section I of the report discusses authority relations in higher education. Section II reviews the history and experiences of Academic Senates. The third section examines the Academic Senate at Penn State by presenting a brief history of the 1966 reorganization and discussing the Senate's activities, its forensic function, the Committee composition, and senate-administrative relations. It is concluded that changing the structural characteristics of senates may not affect the scope of their operations. Empirical data on senators and the study's methodology are included in the appendices. (AF)

ED054741

The Academic Senate at The Pennsylvania State University

Kenneth P. Mortimer and David W. Leslie

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE002543

Center for the Study of Higher Education The Pennsylvania State University
Report No. 11

ED054741

The Academic Senate at The Pennsylvania State University

Kenneth P. Mortimer and David W. Leslie,
with the assistance of Karen Bloom

Center for the Study of Higher Education
Report No. 11

August 1971

The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania

Table of Contents

Foreword	*v*
Preface	*vii*
Authority Relations in Higher Education	1
Academic Senates--A Review	7
The Pennsylvania State University Academic Senate	14
A Brief History of the 1966 Reorganization	14
Senate Committee Activities at Penn State	20
The Forensic Function	29
Committee Composition	31
Senate-Administrative Relations	41
Summary and Conclusions	49
Appendix A--Empirical Data on Senators	57
Appendix B--Methodology	67
References	69
Notes on the Authors	71

FOREWORD

As a result of certain tension which existed within the psychology department at Harvard University in the early 1940s, the university appointed a commission in May, 1945 to make a report on *The Place of Psychology in an Ideal University*.* The Commission was a distinguished one but slow in reporting. Harvard's faculty refused to wait for the report and reorganized the psychology department and related departments in terms of its own needs before the report was available. President Conant, in the foreword to the report comments: "Those familiar with Harvard and its tradition of dissent will not be altogether surprised and may even be amused that affairs should have taken this somewhat unusual turn."

The study of The Pennsylvania State University Senate reported herein began in the Fall of 1969 when all seemed well with that body. When the study was completed and put in report form, the senate under study had ceased to exist and the new University Faculty Senate was in being! We do not want to pretend that we

---

*_The Place of Psychology in an Ideal University_, The Report of the University Commission to Advise on the Future of Psychology at Harvard (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947).

had the security of a Harvard faculty in resolving what might seem to have been a dilemma in reference to continuing and reporting our research, but our researchers have perservered and herewith is their report. The development of the "new" senate is recognized in the first section of the report.

To some, the development might seem to negate any value of the study. But the Center director and the authors of the report do not believe this to be the case. A case study can never be anything more than a report of a situation, an experience, or an organization at a given moment in time. It can, however, illuminate experience or organizational dynamics and hence increase understanding on which projection, prediction, and planned change must rest. We believe all who are interested in the more generalized matter of decision making and the roles of faculty in college and university governance will find this study of some relevance. Even the "old" senate which was under study had to make way for a "new."

G. Lester Anderson

PREFACE

This report is a case study of the Academic Senate at The Pennsylvania State University. The Pennsylvania State University is the Land Grant institution in Pennsylvania. It is a multi-campus university; the main campus is located at University Park and a system of 18 predominantly two-year "Commonwealth Campuses" are distributed throughout the state. In addition, a medical school is located in Hershey, graduate center at King of Prussia, and a junior-senior division college also offering Masters' degrees -- Capitol Campus -- is located at Middletown. Total university enrollment is approximately 40,000 students, with about 25,000 enrolled on the University Park campus. Internally, the university is organized into 10 colleges plus the medical school and Capitol Campus.

The information reported in this study is based on the organization and functioning of the Academic Senate at The Pennsylvania State University from 1966 through 1970. The Board of Trustees issued a statement, effective July 1, 1970, that altered the internal distribution of authority and gave the president of the university the power to establish policies in a number of areas including educational policies and planning, student affairs, the instructional program, courses and curriculum, personnel, admissions, graduation requirements, scholarships and honors,

calendar requirements, business planning, research and finances. The president was directed at the same time to delegate policy-making powers to the faculty "as appropriately organized" in the areas of instructional programs, admissions, graduation requirements and scholarships and honors. No mention was made of the existent Academic Senate.

The board also directed that a "university council" be formed to include faculty, administrators and students. It is intended that the council establish policy over academic program priorities and that it serve as an advisory body to the president. The effective date of this order coincided with the commencement of John W. Oswald's tenure as president.

The membership of the university council was completed during the winter term of 1971 and it is beginning to determine its mission. During the 1970-71 academic year, President Oswald chose to recognize the Academic Senate as the appropriately organized faculty body although some changes were made to reflect the new responsibilities of the president. In the interim, a Task Force on Faculty Organization drafted a new constitution and bylaws to reorganize the senate, with 89 percent of those faculty who cast their mail ballot approving the original task force recommendations. (Two recommendations for changes were made by the entire senate and they were approved by the faculty).

The new documents, which went into effect on July 1, 1971, are an explicit recognition of the revised authority structure dictated by the trustees' action of June 11, 1970. All senate actions, even legislative, are henceforth subject to the revision and orders of the president of the university rather than the board. The new (1971-72) senate has a broader membership, including up to approximately 10 percent students, and each campus of the University other than University Park constitutes a voting unit and therefore elects a representative to the senate.

Finally, the 1971-72 documents reduce the number of standing senate committees from 10 to 8 by consolidating the 1970-71 Committees on Resident Instruction, Continuing Education and Academic Development into one Academic Affairs Committee and by splitting up the 1970-71 Committee on Research and Graduate Study. The "research" part of the old committee's work goes to the new Academic Affairs Committee and "graduate study" part is delegated to the Graduate School. A new Committee on Intra-University Relations is created to make recommendations on and to assist in the delegation of specific legislative, advisory or consultative functions to other appropriate faculty organizations, presumably constituent departments and colleges.

This report on the senate will provide a brief discussion of changing authority relations in higher education and a review of

literature relevant to academic senates before proceeding to the case study material. The case study has six sections: a brief history of the senate, a description of committee activities, data on the composition of senate committees, a section of the forensic function and one on Senate-administrative relations. The final section argues that changing the structural characteristics of senates may not affect the scope of their operations.

The authors wish to acknowledge the generous cooperation of senate officers and senate members during the conduct of this study. Their willingness to be interviewed at length provided us with rich sources of information and insight. Responsibility for the accuracy of the reported data is, of course, the authors'. Acknowledgement is also due Karen Bloom for her very competent assistance in gathering and analyzing the data on senate personnel.

Authority Relations in Higher Education

Authority relations in higher education are in a state of flux. Colleges and universities are caught in the squeeze of seemingly contradictory demands for external accountability and increased participation in governance from internal constituencies such as student governments and faculty senates. Before discussing the strengths and weaknesses of faculty senates and presenting case study data on the Academic Senate at Penn State, a brief discussion of changing authority relationships in higher education will provide a frame of reference for the analysis of internal governance patterns.

External Authority

The challenges to traditional institutional authority relationships from external sources take four major forms: governmental intervention, judicial rulings, statewide coordination and planning, and multi-campus systems. Robert O'Neil (1971, p. 5) has argued that external forces constitute a greater threat to institutional or faculty autonomy than the intrinsic limitations on internal self-government. It is certain that external agencies are introducing new constraints on the governance processes of individual institutions.

One rather obvious challenge to traditional institutional governance patterns is increasing governmental intervention from

legislative, executive and other civil authorities. In its 1970 session, the California State Legislature granted 5 percent cost of living pay raises to all state employees except faculty members of the University of California and the California State College systems. Although some regarded this as a punitive or disciplinary action, public colleges and universities are continually being reminded of their dependence on legislative appropriations. The Pennsylvania State Legislature failed to appropriate funds for the operation of The Pennsylvania State University until midway through the 1970 fiscal year. The interest payments ($5,000-$6,000 per day) on the loans necessary to keep operating were a considerable strain on the university's resources. Even when appropriated, the use of funds may be circumscribed because some state departments of finance have virtual line item control of the budgets of state colleges (McConnell, 1966, pp. 94-96).

There are other legislative incursions into what traditionally have been institutional decisions. Recently, the Michigan legislature passed legislation regulating faculty teaching load requirements. In Ohio, the legislature adopted House Bill 1219 under which the arrest of a faculty member or student or staff member sets in motion a complex process of hearings and appeals and which, in cases of adverse findings, makes dismissal automatic (O'Neil, 1971, p. 25).

A second external challenge to institutional governance patterns is the increasing resort to civil authority in campus crises and disciplinary cases. "The presence of community police, the highway patrol and the National Guard and the raids made by police without prior consultation with university administrators, all symbolize the fact that colleges and universities have increasingly surrendered the privilege of self regulation to the external authority of the police and the courts (McConnell, 1971, p. 14)." O'Neil (1971, p. 32) argues that the courts are beginning to intervene through the use of grand jury investigations and reports in a variety of campus disputes, especially after the closing of many institutions in the spring of 1970.

The trend towards statewide coordination and master planning is also changing traditional authority relationships in higher education. According to Berdahl (1970, p. 35) coordinating and governing agencies are operative in 46 states. Twenty-seven states have completed master plans and 11 others are either in the process of completing such plans or have plans to develop them. In many cases, these plans threaten to move the locus of decision-making authority on certain issues away from the individual campus through the use of program budgeting and other such techniques. The final decision on whether to adopt a new program or to increase enrollments is often made by a state office rather than

by the institution.

A fourth external factor that is challenging traditional governance patterns is the increasing frequency of multi-campus systems. California has 9 university and 18 state college campuses. New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Texas, North Carolina, and many others also have multi-campus systems, and some universities have a large number of branch campuses. The individual campus' capacity to make binding decisions is circumscribed by these systems or university-wide governing structures.

Internal Authority

Within institutions, some governing boards are attempting to enhance the control of institutions through greater involvement in internal governance matters and through the use of their veto power. The Pennsylvania State University Board of Trustees issued a document in June 1970, which redistributed internal power and authority relationships and clarified the role of the president. In the past two or three years, the University of California Board of Regents has adopted a position of watchdog over such previously unmonitored areas as curriculum and personnel appointments on individual campuses. Recent pressure by the Board of Regents at the University of Texas resulted in the firing of a college dean.

In the face of these challenges from external agencies and

governing boards, faculty and students are demanding more sharing of authority within the institution. A national study of governance at 19 campuses proposes "a reconsideration of authority relationships with a view to a more effective hearing for students, faculty and other inadequately heeded constituencies (Keeton, 1971, p. 6)."

Shared Authority

The recent history of faculty participation in campus governance has shown a preoccupation with the term "shared authority" as the means to implement the goal of increased faculty involvement.

Shared authority represents the middle zone of an authority continuum that ranges from administrative dominance on one end to faculty dominance on the other (AAHE, 1967, pp. 14-16). In a system of shared authority, both the faculty and administration have effective influence in decision making. Although not precisely definable, the concept of effective influence involves faculty participation relatively early in the decision-making process and a recognition that there are some issues, such as grading, on which faculty views should prevail and other issues, such as business management, on which administrative views should prevail. Faculty influence should be effective on such aggregate issues as educational, administrative and personnel policies and economic matters, as well as the procedures for making decisions

on questions of concern to individual faculty. The most recent statement on shared authority, by AAHE (Keeton, 1971, p. 148), says that the sharing of authority takes two forms. One form is joint participation in deciding and the other is agreeing that different parties will, within defined limits, make the decision alone. Shared authority debates tend to hang on this distinction between joint involvement and separate jurisdiction.

It has become increasingly apparent that the future viability of joint participation-separate jurisdictions mechanisms will rely heavily upon the relationships that are developed between faculty and administrative members. According to President Charles Hitch of the University of California, "At the heart of the problem of administrative governance of the university is the relationship between the administration and the faculty, and the role played by each in determining what things are done and how they are done in the university (*University Bulletin*, August 3, 1970, p. 6)." President Hitch argues persuasively that there is a crucial need for clarification of the relative roles to be performed by faculty and administrators in the internal governance of the university. Some would include Boards of Trustees, students and other constituencies in this clarification process. In the absence of such clarification, Livingston (1969, p. 166) has said that "...the prospect is for increased tension between faculty and governing boards with administrators caught hopelessly in the

middle."

These pressures for adoption of joint participation and separate jurisdiction mechanisms are such that over 300 institutions are experimenting with campus senates comprised of students, faculty and administrative members (Hodgkinson, 1970, p. 6). New senates are being created and structures are being modified to provide more direct input and broader representation in campus governance.

Academic Senates -- A Review

Over the years, a series of articles has appeared in the *AAUP Bulletin* entitled: "Faculty Participation in the Government of the University." They have described the structure of some faculty senates but have given little attention to informal factors and functions (Adams, 1963; Eckert, 1959 and 1970; Eley, 1964; Morrow, 1963; and Jones, 1966). A careful review of this and more recent literature about academic senates has revealed some advantages and disadvantages in their structural arrangements.

The Strengths of Senates

The advocates of strong faculty senates often argue that it is necessary to organize formally the faculty viewpoint in one central organization. The existence of a senate is said to have a favorable effect on faculty morale. The argument is that the decisions made by academic senates are regarded as legitimate by the faculty because they are examples of professional or peer

control in such important areas as curriculum and education policy and planning. Faculty decisions made through academic senates are contrasted with arbitrary administrative actions that do not sufficiently weigh the faculty viewpoint.

Apparently some supporters believe that decisions by faculty will be better than those made by administrators. Lieberman (1969) and others, however, point out that an arbitrary decision, or one that violates the canons of procedural due process, is no more acceptable because it is made by faculty members than by administrators. Emphasis on faculty as well as administrative due process has led to more vigorous support for collective negotiations and binding procedures for participation in campus decision making as an alternative to academic senates.

Academic senates are supported as deliberative bodies in which fundamental problems of the university may be discussed. In this campus-wide forum, proposals for educational reform and instructional relevancy are debated by a group of faculty members chosen for this purpose by their colleagues. By organizing the faculty at the university-wide level, central faculty review of these proposals is assured.

A senate is also thought to provide an opportunity for joint faculty and administrative participation in decision making. A senate provides a formal organization that is representative of the faculty viewpoints and it can interpret these viewpoints to

the administration and other "nonfaculty" agents. In this manner, faculty advice on significant questions of educational policy is assured.

Another advantage of faculty senates is the protection of faculty interests. In some respects, it is necessary to develop procedures to assure that faculty economic and employment interests are protected. Senates are often charged with the responsibility for protecting and interpreting principles of academic freedom and the protection of privilege and tenure rights.

The Trouble with Senates

Myron Lieberman, (1969) a severe critic of faculty senates, has argued that these bodies are unable to perform the protective function adequately. According to Lieberman, senates are characterized by some of the objectionable features associated with industrial employer councils before the Wagner Act of 1935. Senates typically lack funds independent of those provided by the administration. They are, therefore, gravely handicapped in securing services needed for effective representation of faculty interests. Senates often are not likely to have the negotiating, actuarial, accounting, legal and other expertise needed for effective representation of these interests. Even if the faculty of a large university should include such experts in its membership, they do not necessarily participate in senate activities.

Lieberman cites another disadvantage of academic senates when he states that they are typically employer dominated. They have become an official organ of the university and require administrative or trustee approval before changes can be made in their organizational structure. In short, senates are organized by and accountable to the administration and the board and do not have sufficient autonomy to maintain a pure faculty viewpoint.

On the other hand, President Hitch of the University of California has complained that the separation between the senate and the administration there is too great. He cited the case of the senate's Committee on Privilege and Tenure, which had adopted a protective attitude about the rights and privileges of faculty members. The committee assumed no responsibility for finding the facts of the matter but tended to operate as an agency to protect the faculty member against charges by the administration. Hitch lamented this lack of objectivity in determining faculty rights and privileges (*University Bulletin*, p. 8).

Recent research by McConnell and Mortimer (1971) has revealed some problems in the composition of faculty senates at three institutions. Senates tend to be controlled by a relatively small minority of faculty oligarchs who spend a great deal of time on senate activities and committees. Although the characteristics of the oligarchs tend to vary among institutions they generally

are full professors with considerable length of service in the institution. Certain senate committees tend to exclude junior faculty members from their membership as well as those faculty whose educational or political views are deemed radical.

A result of this minority control of senate bodies is a rising concern about their representative character. It is becoming increasingly apparent that certain elements of the university community are not represented in the senate or on its committees. Young faculty members find it difficult to get elected to the senate or appointed to some of its committees. Radical faculty often claim they are excluded as do students, in some cases. One institution consistently underrepresented faculty members from the foreign languages and some professional schools on senate committees. At another institution, the majority political faction denied the opposing faction a seat on the important executive committee. At another institution, two-thirds of the committee appointees also had substantial administrative responsibilities thus raising the question of whether these were faculty or administrative committees. (For a more complete discussion of these data see Mortimer, 1971.)

In large multi-campus universities, senates are often criticized because they are geographically unbalanced. The university-wide senate of the University of California was at one time

dominated by the Berkeley and Los Angeles divisions (Fitzgibbon, 1968). The University of Minnesota senate was dominated until 1969-70 by the Minneapolis-St. Paul campus. Recent changes in the structure of that senate have recognized the multi-campus composition of the university by establishing assemblies on the individual campuses.

Senates are often critized because their committee structures are unwieldy and their administrative structures do not properly provide for coordination of committees and administrative follow-up of committee details -- the senate at Berkeley has over 30 standing committees. It is not uncommon for a charge to a senate committee to go unanswered for more than a year. Often there is no central mechanism within senates that assumes the responsibility for routine follow-up.

Another problem with senates is that they do not operate well in times of crisis. They are not organized to act precipitously but tend to be stronger in situations where there is time to debate, sharpen and qualify alternatives before acting. In crisis situations, there is seldom enough time for open debate and purposeful consideration of alternatives. As a result, administrators may be reluctant to consult with the senate in cases where time is a crucial factor.

Internal politicization of senates confounds their operation on many campuses. Ideological conflicts, the differences between

younger faculty and their senior colleagues and some of the more mundane power conflicts over who is to make what decisions have turned some senates into arenas where politics rather than educational policies are the points at issue (Mortimer, 1971, pp. 19-22).

Another problem is that there is little consensus about the kinds of activities and decisions in which the university-wide or campus senate should be involved. Internal conflict often focuses on the senate's role on a given question. Frequently, debate includes suggestions that the issue be referred to some other agency. Senates are often critized because they deal with secondary issues like faculty parking. Critics argue that many of these issues are matters of administrative detail and ought not to be taken up by a deliberative body like an academic senate. This function is one that is properly delegated to administrations. There is then a need for better clarification of jurisdiction between faculty and administrators (Ikenberry, 1970). Whether separate jurisdictions can be identified and operationally defined is an important factor in the clarification process.

In summary, senates are supported by some as a mechanism to involve faculty in governance at the campus level. They provide opportunities for joint participation in decision making and for substantive debate on proposals for educational policy and they can protect the faculty's interests and rights. Senates are

critized for lack of autonomy, oligarchic control, inadequate representativeness, administrative inefficiency, failure to act in crises, internal politicization and lack of consensus about their functions. The next sections of this report describe the structure and operation of Penn State's academic senate.

The Pennsylvania State University Academic Senate

The senate at Penn State was formed as a legislative body in 1921. Prior to that time, whatever educational matters the faculty considered were handled by a general assembly. A formal constitution and set of bylaws was finally adopted in 1932 and remained in effect until the reorganization of 1966. (See Appendix B for a description of the methodology used in this report.)

A Brief History of the 1966 Reorganization

There was considerable dissatisfaction by both administrators and faculty with the 3:2 ratio of administrative to faculty members in the pre-1966 senate. In April 1964, President Eric Walker made a speech to the senate and encouraged a reexamination of its constitution and bylaws. He referred specifically to an unwieldy committee structure and to the need for some decentralization of authority within the university.

As a result of this speech, the Senate Committee on Educational Policy was charged to consider reorganizing the senate, and eventually three separate committees became involved. The Committee on Educational Policy initially handled the matter. At a

later point, a committee on new membership was appointed, since one of the principal concerns of the reorganization was to be the basis on which membership should be chosen. The Committee on Educational Policy and the ad hoc Committee on Membership had joint meetings and eventually President Walker appointed a third committee to prepare a final proposal for consideration by the entire Senate.

Interview data indicates that although the administration initiated the reform, it adopted a "hands off" policy about the substance of senate reorganization. The new ad hoc, or the third committee, appointed by the president was given informal instructions to act as a floor manager for the proposed legislation and to attempt to get some consensus about change before bringing it to a vote on the senate floor.

Extensive hearings were held by the new ad hoc committee and an effort was made to resolve differences among the various parties to the dispute so that whatever proposal reached the floor of the senate would eventually be passed.

To the previous legislative duties of the senate, the new constitution adopted in 1966, added advisory and forensic functions. According to the constitution, (Article I, section 1), the senate was to serve as:

> the sole legislative body representing the University Faculty as a whole. Its actions shall be authoritative

on all matters that pertain to the educational interests of the University (graduate and undergraduate resident instruction, research, and continuing education) and on all educational matters that concern the faculties of more than one College, subject to the revision and all orders of the Board of Trustees. The faculty of the Graduate School has general responsibility for all interests of the Graduate School; it shall administer its own affairs subject to review by the Senate. Among the matters within the legislative jurisdiction of the Senate are the following:

(1) Broad educational policy
(2) Courses and programs of study
(3) Admissions
(4) Graduation requirements
(5) Scholarships and honors
(6) University calendar policy
(7) Regulations affecting students
(8) Faculty affairs

The constitution also specified that the senate act as an advisory body to the president on any matter affecting the attainment of the educational objectives of the university. This included the establishment, reorganization or discontinuation of organizational units and areas of instruction or research as well as policies on the planning of some physical facilities, library policies, university development and resource utilization and other matters relating to the university's general welfare.

According to the constitution, the senate was also to serve as a forum for the exchange of ideas among faculty members. Non-senate members had the right to attend meetings and to gain the privilege of the floor.

The new constitution also changed the administrator-faculty ratio in the senate. Before 1966, it was composed of approximately

three administrators for every two faculty members. Sixty percent of the senate's members were chosen because they occupied specific administrative positions. Under the new constitution, elected faculty members now comprised 85 percent of the senate's membership. Up to 15 percent could be ex officio or appointed members including: the president; the provost; chief executive officers for academic affairs, research,continuing education and student affairs; the dean of each college and of the Graduate School; the coordinator of ROTC; the director of libraries and the director of counseling. The directors of each Commonwealth campus were dropped from the membership of the post-1966 senate. The president could appoint others to the senate but the total number of ex officio and appointed members could not exceed 15 percent of total membershipship. An ex officio member could not chair a senate committee but could vote in senate meetings and be a member of senate committees.

The change in the senate reduced its size from approximately 300 to 200 members in 1966 but this number rose to 242 in 1969-70. Senators were elected from 12 voting units. Each of the 10 college faculties at University Park comprised one voting unit, the 18 Commonwealth campuses were one voting unit as was the Hershey Medical Center. The faculty at Capitol Campus voted with their departmental affiliates at University Park. Each voting unit

elected 8 senators plus an additional one for every 20 faculty members or fraction thereof.

In the pre-1966 senate, the president of the university had served as chairman. The new senate bylaws provided for the annual election of three senate officers -- a chairman, a vice-chairman and a secretary.

To aid the secretary and the senate's committees, a secretariat was established. Responsible for all official senate notices and publications, the secretariat included the executive secretary of the senate, the university scheduling officer, one representative from the Graduate School admissions office, and one representative from each of the academic services office divisions.

The 1966 bylaws also establish a senate council to coordinate senate committee activities, to provide liaison with the president and to review, coordinate and discuss means for implementing legislation. The council's membership included: the president, the senate chairman, vice-chairman and secretary, the chairmen of standing senate committees and one elected senator from each voting unit. In 1969-70, the council had 26 members.

Ten standing committees were established by the bylaws; there had been 1[illegible] in the pre-1966 senate. (The structure of these committees plus their size and composition is given in Table I.) The bylaws also specify that any student could be appointed to a

TABLE I

Committees of The Pennsylvania State University Academic Senate and Their Faculty and Student Composition*

	Faculty	Students
Academic, Admission and Athletic Standards	7	2
Academic Development	7	2
Committee on Committees and Rules	15	0
Continuing Education	7	2
Curriculum	12	2
Faculty Affairs	7	2
Library	7	2
Research and Graduate Study	7	2
Resident Instruction	12	3
Senate Council	26**	0
Undergraduate Student Affairs	7	7

*Source: *Constitution, Bylaws and Standing Rules of the University Senate*. University Park: Senate Committee on Committees and Rules, 1966.

**Including the president of the university.

committee. Committee charges specified the number of students to be included on each committee and it ranged from none on the Committee on Committees and Rules to seven (50 percent of the membership) on the Undergraduate Student Affairs Committee. The usual wording provided for two students on most other committees.

At least half of the membership of a standing committee had to be elected senators, according to the new rules. The Committee on Committees and Rules appointed the senatorial members of committees but each committee was free to add other faculty, students or administrators to its membership. This provision has been used to strengthen faculty-administrative relationships, a topic that will be discussed later in this report, and to make use of faculty expertise in matters of interest to the committee.

Senate Committee Activities at Penn State

While committee structures and titles are informative, often they are not indicative of what committees actually do. To ascertain what activities Penn State senate committees perform, the 1969-70 chairman or vice-chairman of each senate committee was interviewed and committee reports from 1966-67 to 1969-70 were analyzed.

A former senate chairman classified the 10 standing committees into two categories, legislative and advisory, according to their principal activity. Legislative committees included those on

Curriculum, Resident Instruction, Academic, Admission and Athletic Standards (AAAS), Undergraduate Student Affairs and the Committee on Committees and Rules. The advisory committees were Academic Development, Libraries, Faculty Affairs, Research and Graduate Study, and Continuing Education.

Legislative Committees

The great bulk of routine senate activity is handled through the five legislative committees. Every request for a new course or change in existing courses and curricular offerings must be handled by the Curriculum Committee, with from 500 to 800 such matters coming up each year. The Committee on Resident Instruction is responsible for legislation and has issued reports on such matters as the university calendar, the quality of instruction, exam periods, registration procedures, honors programs and pass-fail grading. The committee works in close liaison with representatives of the Office of the Vice-President for Academic Affairs in drafting legislation for presentation to the senate.

The Academic, Admissions and Athletic Standards Committee has a broad charge including investigative, initiative, and advisory activities in these three areas. In the three years from 1966-67 to 1969-70, the committee considered general admissions policies, admission of special educational opportunities students (SEOS) standards for scholarships, the number of specific admissions decisions, the application of grading options to ROTC

programs, the elimination of academic probation, and athletic schedules and eligibility. The concentration and importance of SEOS and admissions matters led to the creation of a standing admissions committee in the fall of 1970.

The Undergraduate Student Affairs Committee is concerned with the policies regulating undergraduate student life and with providing a system of appeals and review of student discipline matters. The committee has considered such matters as policies on student-run publications, solicitation in dormitories, a definition of disciplinary probation, visitation policies in dormitories and general student disciplinary systems.

The Committee on Committees and Rules is composed of one senator from each voting unit elected by the senators of that unit. The committee appoints the chairman, vice-chairman and senatorial members of all other standing committees. It is also responsible for clarifying, interpreting and publishing senate rules and procedures.

Each senator is asked to rank his preferences for committee service and these stated preferences are used as aids in the committee appointment process. The committee also utilizes a variety of informal contacts with committee chairmen to evaluate the current membership of committees and to achieve appropriate balance on each committee.

According to one respondent: "The Committee on Committees and Rules tends to be very careful to appoint committees that are likely to produce reports that are responsible and will be favorably received by the senate. The group attempts to avoid appointing committees that are likely to produce reports that are not well thought out and reasoned before they reach the senate floor."

Apparently the committee makes no attempt to keep track of the non-senatorial members of committees. Each senate committee has the power to appoint any faculty member or administrator to its membership. Under this provision, a representative from the Office of the Vice-President for Planning meets regularly with the Committee on Academic Development, a representative from the Admissions Office with the AAAS Committee and someone from the Office of the Vice-President for Academic Affairs meets with the Curriculum and Resident Instruction Committees. The Committee on Committees and Rules makes suggestions about appropriate faculty or administrative members of standing committees but the responsibility for appointing them is within each committee.

The Committee on Committees and Rules is also charged with the responsibility of evaluating student participation on senate committees. In an April 1968 report the committee recommended that students continue to be represented on senate committees.

In performing its role as guardian and interpreter of senate rules, the committee has dealt with a number of problems including procedures for forensic business, legislation for fixing a quorum at 60 members, and procedures used to elect senators from one of the colleges. A major portion of committee time in 1969-70 was devoted to holding hearings and conducting open debate about the details of legislation designed to make students voting members of the senate. The committee's proposal was accepted by the senate with a few modifications, but the Board of Trustees delayed action pending further review of the entire senate.

Advisory Committees

The five advisory committees are so classified because they do not have significant routine work loads and areas of responsibility. These committees deal with a wide range of problems.

The Committee on Academic Development is charged to make recommendations on and provide continuing awareness about matters affecting the attainment of the educational objectives of the university. It has issued reports on the academic feasibility of establishing schools of law and veterinary medicine and the climate for higher education in Pennsylvania. The committee is also guiding a study of the academic characteristics of the university.

The Libraries and Other Information Systems Committee makes recommendations on library policies and on information storage

and retrieval matters. Its major concern in recent years has been to develop a policy statement on the utilization of the libraries on the Commonwealth campuses.

The Faculty Affairs Committee is charged to make recommendations on matters effecting faculty personnel policies and the educational environment in which the faculty works. Matters which the committee has considered in recent years include faculty participation in governance and in the selection of college deans, a proposal to build a faculty club, the establishment of a grievance and appeal system for non-tenured faculty, patterns of academic counseling and the effects of tardy legislative action on the university budget.

The Committee on Research and Graduate Study is charged to recommend policies on the dissemination of knowledge through research and graduate study and to maintain liaison with the graduate faculty and research agencies. The constitution specifies, however, that the Graduate School faculty, a non-senate body, shall have general responsibility for all interests of the Graduate School and be subject to review by the senate. The committee has had little chance to review the policies, procedures and practices of the graduate faculty. It has considered such research problems as the relationship of institutes to faculty research and graduate instruction, research institute structures and the ethics of

classified research on the campus.

The Committee on Continuing Education is charged to make recommendations on policies concerning the continuing education mission of the university. The committee got off to a rather slow start and met infrequently during its first years. At this writing, it is considering the role of continuing education at Penn State.

The Senate Council

The Senate Council, which has no legislative authority of its own, is charged to coordinate the activities of the senate's standing committees and to review, coordinate and discuss means of implementing legislation. The council is also charged to provide liaison with the president of the university.

The council's membership is comprised of the president, the three principal officers of the senate, the chairman of each standing senate committee and one senator elected for a one-year term from each voting unit. The council meets regularly about a week or two in advance of each senate meeting and also when specially convened by either the president or the chairman of the senate.

In practice, a large portion of the regular meetings of the council are spent in reviewing and discussing reports that come from various committees. The council serves as a sounding board

for these reports and asks questions about their substance. Unfortunately, this review process tends to be hampered by the fact that committee reports are often not available to council members before the meeting when they are to be considered. Interviewees reported that there is usually a stack of reports on the table when they arrive at the meeting and that they have little chance for prior review. Occasionally, these reports will be amended in an oral presentation by the committee chairman.

According to those interviewed, discussion on committee reports can be quite vigorous and reports are sometimes voluntarily withdrawn by the committee chairman. There appears to be a feeling that if significant disagreements occur in a council meeting, a report is not likely to be accepted by the senate, especially if legislation is being proposed.

It also appears that the council acts as a sounding board for proposals and other matters that may be pending in committees. The council can and does ask senate committees to consider various viewpoints in writing a report. In performing this informal sounding-board function, the council succeeds in firming up the precision and substance of committee reports and screening out improper or "unworkable" proposals before they reach the senate floor.

Presidential liaison is another function that the council

performs. President Walker attended the meetings quite regularly but there was some complaint about the council's liaison practices, including the fact that the council's size, 26 members, discouraged dialogue between the president and the council. Members of the administration argued that the council should serve as a place where ideas might be discussed without commitments being made but that lack of confidentiality hindered such discussions. Often, discussions in council meetings would be reported in other places on campus and administration's position would be widely thought to be that expressed in the meeting. These informal reports resulted in misunderstandings or misinterpretation of administrative intentions.

Another criticism of the council's liaison function was directed toward the one-year terms of elected senators from each voting unit. Some people felt that the turnover associated with the one-year term and the caliber of senators elected to the council hurt the level, continuity and confidentiality of the discussions. New members were sometimes unfamiliar with the evolution and details of the problem under consideration and were, therefore, unable to react to the substance of the matter. It was argued that one year is not sufficient time to develop sophistication about matters of student affairs or admissions policies.

Lack of time to adequately review committee reports, large size and lack of confidentiality and continuity of the council were the important factors that were thought to hinder the development of adequate liaison with the administration through the council. Another factor may have been of equal importance -- lack of administrative willingness to participate vigorously in the council's discussions. Although more will be said about this later in the report, those interviewed often complained that while the president raised questions and answered requests for information from council members, he seldom took formal positions on matters before the council. Council members complained that many of the administrative objections to such reforms as the proposed University Judiciary Board were not voiced when the matter was discussed in council meetings or on the floor of the senate. Some critics of this practice believed that the president preferred to issue negative recommendations privately to the Board of Trustees rather than defend them in the council or on the floor of the senate.

The Forensic Function

The constitution [Article I, section (c)] charges the senate "To serve as a forum for the exchange of ideas among the members of the University Faculty." Forensic business is a specific item on the agenda and is followed by remarks from the president.

Typically, the forensic portion of the meeting offers an opportunity for exchange of views among members of the university community. During the spring of 1970, the campus was rocked by student demonstrations concerning Black Student League disruptions at the Ogontz campus, demonstrations by the Black Student Union at University Park, and the Cambodian intervention. Three specially convened senate meetings were held during these crises. In this capacity, the senate served as a communication device for public debate among faculty and students. Senates at other universities (Berkeley and Minnesota) have served a similar communication role during crises.

Those interviewed were sharply divided as to the usefulness of special meetings. One of the meetings was held in a large auditorium with approximately 1,000 students in attendance. (Students are allowed to attend meetings but seldom exercise this privilege to any great extent.) The students began to cheer or boo speakers at the meeting and apparently this was threatening to many senators.

There were various attempts to limit debate at some of these meetings -- first to 10- and later to 3- minute statements. Those who held forensic meetings in low regard wanted sharply limited debate while supporters of these meetings favored broader, if any, limits on debate. This latter group argued that the senate should

be a forum or communication device for matters of concern to the entire university. Those who would limit debate argued that the debate in such meetings was often uninformed and irrelevant.

In these forensic meetings and during the 1969-70 year, the president did not choose to use his place on the agenda to address the senate. Debate in the senate was conducted among faculty and students with little or no administrative participation.

In what seemed more normal times, the forensic portion of senate meetings had been used to discuss questions of general interest such as better faculty-student communications. Although some people interviewed placed little value on the forensic function, others believe it is the senate's *raison d'etre*. According to one respondent, "The senate should be regarded not as an arm of the administration but as a communications device. It should be evaluated on how well it fosters communication among members of the university community, not on its efficiency or the number of reports issued by its committees."

Committee Composition

In order to determine the representative character of the senate and senate committee members, empirical data were gathered. A 5 by 8 card was prepared for each senator for 1967-68, 1968-69, and 1969-70 and data were compiled on his senate committee service and six demographic facts -- sex, rank, age, length of service at

Penn State, administrative responsibilities and voting unit. The compilation tables can be found in Appendix A.

The statistics reported on these data are descriptive, not inferential. The data are based on populations, not samples, and no inference need be made. Total university data are not readily available on all the variables but comparisons are provided where information is available.

Sex

Table 2 (Appendix A) gives the sex distribution of senate and committee members over the three academic years, 1967-68, 1968-69, and 1969-70.

There has been a gradual increase in the proportion of male senators to female senators, with the most recent figures showing 94.3 percent of the membership to be male and 5.7 percent to be female. In 1969-70, total university faculty percentages were 90.4 percent male and 9.6 percent female, so an imbalance of about 4 percentage points in favor of males existed in that year.

An increasing number of female senators do serve on senate committees however. For the most recent year, 1969-70, 64.4 percent of the female senate members served on committees, while only 35 percent of the male senators did so. In 1967-68, these figures were much closer to being even: 39.8 percent of the men served on committees and 44.5 percent of the women did so.

Four committees have had women members throughout the period under study. They are the Committee on Committees and Rules, the Committee on Faculty Affairs, the Committee on Resident Instruction, and the Committee on Undergraduate Student Affairs. Five committees rarely or never have had women as members during these three years. The Committee on Academic, Admissions, and Athletics Standards and the Committee on Research and Graduate Study had no women members during this period, while the Committees on Academic Development, Continuing Education, and Curriculum each had one woman member during one of the three years. The Committee on Libraries and Other Information Systems has had women members in each of the last two years, but not in 1967-68. Women committee officers are becoming more common, moving from only one (5.9 percent) in 1967-68 to three (15 percent) in 1969-70 (Table 3, Appendix A).

Academic Rank

Table 4 (Appendix A) shows senate and committee membership by academic rank. The rank of "instructor" is excluded since persons of that rank (who compose nearly one-quarter of the whole faculty) are not included within the definition of the senate's "electorate." The total figures on senate membership for each year are lower than the actual total membership figure because a number, varying from 7 to 12, of appointed and ex officio senators, have no rank.

Full professors are clearly over-represented when total university proportions are compared to those of senate and committee members and committee chairmen who are full professors. Approximately 27 to 30 percent of the university professorial faculty had full professorships over the three-year period, yet from 58 to 66 percent of the senate's members were full professors, as were from 55 to 69 percent of its committee members and 75 to 85 percent of committee officers. While assistant professors accounted for approximately 42 percent of the professorial faculty, only 10 to 15 percent of the senate's members were from this rank as were from 9 to 15 percent of the committee members and about 5 percent (N=1) of committee officers. (There was one assistant professor who served as vice-chairman of one committee.) The proportion of senate and committee members who were assistant professors increased over the three-year period, from approximately 10 percent to 15 percent in both cases.

Committee officers rotated with some frequency. Thus far in the history of the new senate (four years but the fourth year is not included in the table), only three committees have had single individuals serving in an office (chairman and/or vice-chairman) for as long as three years. These are the Committees on Continuing Education, Faculty Affairs, and Academic, Admissions, and Athletic Standards. Seven committees have had, at one time or another,

chairmen serve for two years.

Data gathered but not reported in Table 5 show that assistant professors have not been on the AAAS Committee but have been otherwise spread through a number of others. Some committees, such as Research and Graduate Study and the Committee on Committees and Rules, have been staffed largely by full professors.

Age

Table 5 (Appendix A) presents the mean ages of senate members, committee members, and committee officers for each of the three years. In general, the senate and its committees have been populated by men and women with an average age of about 48. Committee officers do not appear to have been substantially older or younger than other committee members, but they have tended to be slightly younger than the overall senate membership.

The Committee on Continuing Education was, in 1967-68, composed of members whose mean age was substantially above that for the whole senate and any of its other committees. (There is a relatively small standard deviation of 3.7 years.) The reported mean age of the members of this committee dropped dramatically the following year (accompanied by an increased dispersion of ages). An inspection of the records indicates that all members of the 1967-68 committee on Continuing Education were replaced by new members for 1968-69. A similar trend, but in the direction of

increased age, was evident for the Committee on Research and Graduate Study. All but one of the 1968-69 members of this committee were replaced for 1969-70, accounting for the increased mean age and the increased dispersion of members' ages.

All but one of the removed members of both committees remained senators in the following year, and were presumably available for continued committee service. Interviews with members of the Committee on Committees and Rules revealed that there was some dissatisfaction with the activities of both committees and membership was drastically altered to revitalize them.

Three committees, Curriculum, Library and Other Information Systems and Undergraduate Student Affairs, have consistently had lower mean ages than the mean age for the whole senate. There have been no committees with a mean age consistently greater over the three years than that of the entire senate.

Length of Service at Penn State

Table 6 reports the mean length of service at Penn State for senate members, committee members, and committee officers for the years 1967-68 to 1969-70. As was the case with age, the mean number of years at Penn State (a range of 12.1 to 13.8 years in a three-year period) of committee officers was similar to that of the average senator (13.3 years for all three years), although the figures for 1969-70 show a small departure from that generalization in the direction of shorter service for committee officers.

Members of the Committee on Committees and Rules (17.2, 18.6 and 16.7 years for each respective year) and the Academic, Admissions and Athletic Standards Committee (16.6, 18.2 and 16 years for each respective year) had consistently longer service records than did members of other committees. In the case of Committees and Rules, this would appear to have implications for the exercise of that body's charge to appoint the members of the other senate committees. About half (seven) of the members of this committee served during all three years of the period under study. Although the average age for Committees and Rules did not depart remarkably from the overall senate figures, members of this committee had, in general, served at Penn State longer than the average senate member, and, particularly, longer than the average member of all senate committees. The task of appointing other committees may logically require committee members who are well acquainted with other faculty members. A similar point might be made with regard to the Academic, Admissions, and Athletic Standards Committee. In that case, three of the members have served for all three years.

The average length of service at Penn State for members of the Committee on Academic Development (6.6, 7.6 and 8.9 years for 1967-68 to 1969-70) was consistently below average for senate members (13.3 years for each year) and for other committee members, and the average length of service for members of the Library and

Other Information Systems Committee was marked by a systematic decrease from 10.7 to 9.1 to 7.7 years.

Administrative Responsibilities

One of the main rationales for reorganizing the senate in 1966-67 was to provide for a greater proportion of faculty members on the senate and its committees. Table 7 (Appendix A) shows the administrative responsibilities of senate members, committee members and committee officers for 1967-68 to 1969-70.

The proportion of senate members without concurrent administrative responsibilities rose steadily from 54.3 percent in 1967-68 to 58.2 percent in 1968-69 and 60.8 percent in 1969-70. The ratio of faculty to administrators was reversed in three years from 60 percent administrative to 60 percent faculty members.

Similarly, the proportion of committee members without concurrent administrative responsibilities rose from 59.3 percent in 1967-68 to 69.4 percent in 1968-69 and 66.7 percent in 1969-70. These figures are consistently higher than the all-senate proportion. The proportion of committee officers without concurrent administrative responsibilities rose from 29.4 in 1967-68 to 65 percent in 1968-69 but dropped to 50 percent in 1969-70.

The chairman of the senate is elected annually. Each of the chairmen since 1967-68 has also occuppied an administrative post concurrent with the chairmanship.

Voting Units

Tables 8,9, and 10 show senate and committee membership by voting unit for 1967-68, 1968-69, and 1969-70. (The voting units are the 10 colleges, the Commonwealth campuses, and the Hershey Medical Center.)

It is apparent that although appointed and ex officio senators comprise 15 percent of the total membership, they are seldom appointed to committees. According to the constitution, committee chairmen must be elected senators. It should also be noted that the number of senators from each voting unit is fixed by a formula in the constitution.

Some trends are evident in the proportional representation of voting units on committees. Agriculture, Engineering, and the Commonwealth campuses have tended to be slightly under-represented on committees. The College of Human Development has been consistently over-represented.

Although generalizations are hard to draw because of the small numbers involved, several patterns are worth noting in the distribution of committee offices. Six voting units, Agriculture, Earth and Mineral Sciences, Education, Human Development, Liberal Arts, and Science, have at one time or another had more than their "share" of committee offices, but this distribution has been fairly well scattered during the period under study. On the other hand,

the Commonwealth campuses, which comprise about 10 percent of the senate membership, have been consistently under-represented in committee offices. Only one Commonwealth campus faculty member has been a committee officer. This is understandable in terms of the fact that Commonwealth campus faculty are dispersed throughout the state, making committee leadership a logistically difficult task. (The same logistical problem is true of Hershey Medical Center personnel whose campus is located about 100 miles from the main campus at University Park.) The only voting unit centered on the main campus that has been similarly under-represented in committee offices is Arts and Architecture.

A Summary of Committee Composition

The data reported in the preceding section illustrate why the representative character of senates is often questioned. Typically, universities have only a small number of women faculty members and this accounts for the small number of women in the senate. While 40 percent of the faculty are assistant professors, senate membership is heavily concentrated in the upper ranks. Although full professors comprise less than one-third of the professorial faculty, they comprise about 60 percent of senate and committee membership and about 75 to 85 percent of important committee officers.

In relatively serene times, such imbalances are considered

normal and part of the governance milieu of universities. In times of crisis, however, these imbalances assume greater importance. Then the "ruling gerontocracy" is severely criticized for being "out of touch" with important components of their constituency. The argument is that a group of full professors with an average age of 48 to 50 and with annual salaries of $18,000 to $22,000 have little in common with assistant professors in their early 30s with annual salaries of from $12,000 to $14,000. The problems, both personal and professional, of these two groups appear to be quite different.

Senate-Administrative Relations

The major problems uncovered in the interview process and in committee reports seem to hinge around the activities of advisory committees and the Undergraduate Student Affairs Committee. The advisory committees have had trouble establishing their mission. The Undergraduate Student Affairs Committee's relations with the administration and the Board of Trustees were discussed at some length in the interviews.

The Committee on Research and Graduate Study has not been successful in establishing an adequate liaison or policy role in either the research or graduate education missions of the university. There is an administrative committee on research, chaired by the vice-president of research, that appears to control the

details and substance of research policy at Penn State. The senate committee has not even been able to establish a policy review role for itself in this decision-making structure.

According to one former chairman of the Research and Graduate Study Committee, "The committee has no authority over research. It can only attempt to set policy, but the research area is an administrative matter that is handled by the vice-president for research." As a result, the committee can serve in an investigatory fashion, a function it is trying to perform concerning the plaee of organized research units on the campus. A subcommittee proposed that the Committee on Research and Graduate Study, or a new committee, review all proposals for new organized research units before they are submitted to the Board of Trustees. The vice-president's office objected strenuously and the proposal was dropped.

The Graduate School is governed largely by the dean and the graduate faculty and is responsible for administering its own affairs, subject to review by the senate. In practice, this review function was not exercised during the three-year period covered in this report. For example, although the senate's Curriculum Committee is charged to make recommendations on new programs and courses, in practice the committee works as a rubber stamp for actions taken by the Graduate School's committees.

There is a Graduate School committee examining the school's governance configurations. Presumably, the committee will attempt

to clarify the role of the senate and its committees in relation to the Graduate School. In the meantime, the senate has little liaison with the Graduate School and its governance mechanisms. In the words of one respondent, "The graduate study function of the senate is non-existent."

Another advisory committee that has had difficulty in developing a mission orientation is the Committee on Academic Development. The charge to the committee is to make recommendations to the senate on academic development matters. The vice-president for planning regularly sends his representative to the committee's meetings but the relations between his office and the committee are vague. Two points may be made in this regard.

On the one hand, the committee has shown little initiative in attacking problems pertaining to the academic development of Penn State. On the other hand, the administration has not chosen to put the committee into the decision-making or review process of its governance structures. The committee chairman claims that the administration makes little, if any, use of the committee by directing questions to it or asking advice on the important developmental questions being considered by the administrative committee on planning. For example, the Planning Office recently produced a five-year plan for the university. Department chairmen and deans were extensively involved in the planning process but neither

the senate nor the Committee on Academic Development were. Apparently neither the chairman of the committee, who sits on the administrative committee on planning, nor members of this latter committee believed that senate or committee participation in the planning process was appropriate or feasible.

One hesitates to say that the administration has been at fault for not involving the senate in the governance process or that the faculty has been to blame for not seizing more initiative. The initiative for developing more dynamic faculty administrative relations is a dual responsibility. It is, however, quite clear from interview data that the central administration had adopted a "hands off" policy towards senate affairs. The administrative posture was that whatever the senate did was its own affair and in those areas the administration's role was to be a passive one.

Except for the Library and Other Information Systems Committee, all the advisory committees appear to be searching for a mission. The Continuing Education Committee did not meet for at least a year and its entire membership was subsequently revised. It is now involved in trying to consider what the role of continuing education at Penn State is and should be. There is, however, an administrative committee on continuing education and the distinctions between the two are yet to be clarified.

Similarly, the Faculty Affairs Committee has been considering fringe benefits and retirement policies and has only recently begun

to consider "some of the more important issues confronting the senate." The committee has recently created a subcommittee on faculty participation in governance.

A particularly troublesome problem between the senate's committees and the administration involved the Undergraduate Student Affairs Committee, a legislative committee composed of seven elected senators and seven undergraduates. It is concerned with the broad policies of student life and with providing a system of appeals and review on matters of discipline. The committee has experienced a more than ordinary difficulty in defining its own areas of responsibility for policy development and those of the Office of the Vice-President for Student Affairs for implementation of policy.

The committee declined to include a representative from the vice-president's office because its members believed that it would inhibit student participation in the committee's deliberations. This was a deviation from the practice of most other senate committees and a source of some concern to members of the administration. Under the pre-1966-67 senate, the membership of the committee was heavily drawn from the administrative staff of the Office of the Vice-President for Student Affairs and there were only a few faculty members on the committee. In 1969-70 there were administrators on the committee.

The traditional faculty-administrative conflicts were compounded when the Undergraduate Student Affairs Committee began to feel that the policies it had written and that the Senate had adopted were not being adequately administered. According to members of the committee, the administration dragged its feet on administering a liberalization of visitation policies in residence halls and resisted changes in the policies regulating student publications. The committee began to feel that it had to draft more specific legislation to ensure that its intent would be carried through in the implementation of policies. The administration, of course, regarded this as an encroachment on its prerogatives.

This conflict was compounded by the fact that the student members of the committee changed from year to year and continuity suffered as a result. Each new "generation" or combination of faculty-student membership wanted to re-write legislation that had been adopted only a few years before. The administration tended to be unsympathetic with each attempt to "re-discover the wheel."

Finally, the experience of the 1969-70 academic year should be mentioned. When the senate adopted a piece of legislation changing its own structure, or the policies on student life, it was passed on to the Board of Trustees for approval. (As of July 1, 1970, the trustees delegated much of this responsibility to the president.) In 1969-70, the trustees rejected a senate-endorsed

proposal for a student disciplinary system called the United Judiciary Board. The Trustees also failed to accept, although they did not specifically reject, a senate-endorsed proposal for student voting rights in the senate. (There was a tacit understanding that the senate was to be reorganized in the near future anyway.) The senate adopted, upon recommendation of the Undergraduate Student Affairs Committee, a liberalized policy on visitation rules in the dormitories which the board also failed to accept, although the policy has been effected by administrative fiat under the new responsibilities of the president.

There was widespread concern among some of the senators interviewed that the administration, although reluctant to challenge any of these proposals on the floor of the senate, was successful in sabotaging them before the Board of Trustees. These faculty members claimed that the administration would often "mutter that the board will never buy that" but would seldom point out specific details of a proposal and recommend that it be changed. The administration's "hands off senate affairs" attitude, coupled with its informal and formal contacts with the board, appears to have resulted in an untenable situation. Many of the faculty would have preferred to have had the opportunity to work out these differences with the administration and attempt to win support for the proposal before it went to the board.

The basic point to be made by the preceding discussion of senate-administrative relations is that there appears to be a great deal of confusion as to where responsibility for action lies. A similar question is how this responsibility is to be shared among administrators, faculty and students. The administration has tended to wait for initiative from the faculty before involving them in the governance process. Senate leaders and committee members criticize the administration for lack of initiative in bringing important issues to the senate or its committee for review and appraisal. The most often heard point on this latter statement is "the fact that the administration has not shown any enthusiasm for the senate is often regarded as indifference to substantive faculty involvement in decision making at the campus level."

It is difficult to assess where the responsibility for developing more substantive faculty involvement in decision making lies or indeed if such is a desirable policy for Penn State to follow. It is clear from this research that neither the administration nor the senate and its committees have developed sufficient sophistication about what kinds of functions and issues the senate should perform. Perhaps this is a function of the relative youth of the Penn State Senate. There is no long tradition of a strong advisory role for the senate at Penn State comparable to that at the University of California at Berkeley or the University of Minnesota. Perhaps three or four years is not enough time for new patterns

of senate-administrative relations to evolve into a system of joint participation in decision making. As mentioned earlier in this report, faculty-administrative relations will be one of the pressing issues facing higher education in the decade of the 70s. Penn State will be no exception.

Summary and Conclusions

The main focus of this report has been on the Academic Senate at The Pennsylvania State University as a means for sharing authority in the governance of one university.

A general review of authority relations in higher education with special emphasis on the concept of shared authority was provided. Recognition was made of decreasing institutional autonomy as external agencies exert more control over the activities of colleges and universities, and account was taken of the increasing demands for involvement on the part of internal participants -- faculty and students in particular. The American Association of University Professors has advocated the sharing of authority among the several interdependent campus constituencies, and many efforts at sharpening the concept, notably by the American Association for Higher Education have been made. A large number of institutions are currently experimenting with governance mechanisms based on the shared authority model, or at least on the model of joint participation.

A second section dealt with the advantages and disadvantages generally imputed to academic senates. Senates are often supported as agencies through which authority can be effectively shared among campus constituencies, as campus-wide forums, as sources of legitimacy for certain kinds of decisions, and as agencies for the protection of faculty interests. On the other hand, senates are often said to lack resources for essential services, and to be too closely associated with the central administration and trustees, although others claim that senates do not have effective channels of communication with administrators and trustees. Senates are also criticized because they lack representativeness, because they do not act with dispatch and responsibility especially in times of crisis, and because they often deal with trivial rather than substantive matters.

The study of The Penn State University Senate was conducted primarily through searching senate minutes, constitutions, and other documents such as committee reports. In addition, indepth interviews were conducted with present and past senate leaders, particularly senate officers and committee members and data on the characteristics of senate and committee members were analyzed. Descriptive efforts were directed at these aspects of the senate: 1) the changes in its constitution in 1966; 2) senate committee activities; 3) its composition and that of

its committees by sex, age, rank, length of service at Penn State, and administrative responsibilities; and 4) senate-administrative relations.

The 1966 constitution added advisory and forensic functions to the senate's legislative function, substantially increased the proportion of elected faculty senators while reducing the size of the senate, reduced the number of standing committees, admitted students to committee membership, established the Senate Council -- a coordinating board -- and made other changes. Motivation for the change apparently arose from dissatisfaction with the senate committee structure and with disproportionate administrative representation in the senate.

The 1967-68 to 1969-70 senate was found to be composed of a disproportionate number from the senior professional ranks as compared with the distribution of all faculty in the various ranks. This imbalance was more marked in committee membership. Women were somewhat under-represented on the senate, but over half (64.4 percent) the women in the senate served on committees during 1969-70. The average senator over the period under study was about 48 years old with approximately 13 years of service at Penn State. Some systematic departures from these averages were observed for some of the committees at various times, a cause for speculation in a few instances. The proportion of senators with administrative responsibilities has been decreasing slowly and stood near

40 percent for the end of the period under study. This figure is the reciprocal of the percentage of senators in the pre-1966 senate holding administrative responsibilities -- 60 percent were full- or part-time administrators. The Commonwealth campuses and the College of Arts and Architecture were found to have been rather consistently under-represented in committee offices.

Senate committees were divided into two general classifications according to the kinds of functions they performed. "Legislative" committees generally had heavy work loads, drew up significant legislation for senate approval, and were charged with making certain decisions. "Advisory" committees had fewer routine activities and often had trouble establishing their respective missions. The Senate Council served as a sounding board for committee reports, screening out those that appeared inappropriate or "unworkable" before they could reach the senate floor. The council also served as an agency for liaison with the president, and there appears to have been considerable dissatisfaction with the effectiveness of this function. The size of the council, lack of confidentiality in its sessions, and the short terms of its members seemed to hinder its effectiveness as a mechanism for open communication with the administration.

One section of the study dealt with the relationship of the senate to the administration. There was considerable evidence in the interviews that the advisory committees and the Undergraduate

Student Affairs Committee could not establish working relationships with those administrators who were responsible for activities supposedly coming under the review of the senate. A clear feeling was expressed among those interviewed that the administration tended to pursue its own goals in certain areas independent of any of the cooperative or participating mechanisms of the senate.

It is this point that seems most aptly to characterize the operation of the Penn State Senate between 1966 and 1970. For one reason or another, the senate did not penetrate some key decision-making processes in the university during that period. No clear evidence emerged as to where responsibility for this situation might be placed. It does seem clear, however, that neither the administration nor the senate and its committees had developed sufficient sophistication about the kinds of functions the senate should perform or about the issues in which it should be involved.

The key question revolves around the scope of the senate's authority. In the case of the senate's advisory functions, and particularly in the work of its "advisory" committees, it seems clear that the "separate jurisdictions" model aptly describes the distribution of authority at Penn State. The senate had little input into the decisions in research, graduate study, continuing education and planning. In the case of the senate's legislative functions, there appears to have been a greater

willingness on the part of administrators to share at least their views, plans and time with senate committees. The major exception was in the area of student affairs where little or no cooperation existed. There was a clear feeling expressed in the interviews that the Senate Council did not serve as a mechanism for sharing authority due to the unwillingness of the administration to use the council for that purpose.

As a minimum requirement, the joint participation model requires the mutual disclosure of information and the discussion of positions among participants. Senate members at Penn State complained with some frequency that on a number of issues they could never tell where the administration stood. Under these conditions it would appear difficult to establish the mutual trust and sense of shared responsibility between faculty and administrators that is required for true joint participation in decision making.

The governance reforms initiated within the past year at Penn State are concerned with some of these problems. A University Council has been established to provide for joint participation of faculty, administrators and students in one body. The changes in the senate constitution explicitly emphasize at several points the need for consultation between senate officers, senate committees and the administration. Further, the proposed changes revise the scope of the senate's legislative jurisdiction

removing the legislative responsibility for student affairs, which had been a particularly sensitive area, and delegating graduate affairs to the Graduate School.

To a great extent, judgments about the course of governance arrangements at Penn State must be held in abeyance. The change in presidents and the increased responsibilities of the office may remove some of the ambivalences which permeated senate-administrative relations from 1966 to 1970. It remains to be seen whether the president, with the directive on governance from the Board of Trustees (see preface), will urge his administrative associates to consult more fully with the senate and its committees. The evolution of the relations between the University Council and the senate and the separation of jurisdictions among these and other structures may have an important bearing on the role the revised senate will play.

The senate revisions of 1966 show that the creation of new structures does not automatically result in new patterns of governance. More important than structural provisions are the attitudes and willingness to share responsibility among participants. Further, it seems reasonable to argue that unless new structures to some extent represent existing decision-making patterns, they will prove to be unstable or ineffective. Where *effective* veto power exists and is exercised independently of

a senate or other body, the prospects for sharing authority may be considerably diminished.

In general, it appears that the efforts to redesign the configurations of governance at Penn State have moved simultaneously toward the joint participation model (the University Council) and toward an assignment of a more realistic role to the senate. The senate that operated from 1966 to 1970 evidently failed in some respects to reflect the existing governance processes. There was apparently an unclear division of responsibilities between the senate and other bodies and a failure to develop a receptive attitude toward the sharing of decision making in some important policy areas. It is this task that continues to face Penn State; the viability of its internal governance patterns may depend largely upon the relationships developed between faculty and administrators. At the least, it seems appropriate to emphasize the likelihood that reforming the *structures* of governance does not guarantee that new structures will prove better or more effective than the old.

APPENDIX A

Empirical Data on Senators

TABLE 2

Sex of Members of The Pennsylvania State University Academic Senate and its Committees for 1967-68 to 1969-70

		1967-68		1968-69		1969-70	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
Total Senate Members	N	201	18	209	16	231	14
	%	91.8	8.2	92.9	7.1	94.3	5.7
Committee on Committees and Rules	N	15	1	13	1	14	2
	%	93.7	6.3	92.8	7.2	87.5	12.5
Committee on Academic Admissions, and Athletic Standards (AAAS)	N	7	0	6	0	7	0
	%	100	---	100	---	100	---
Committee on Academic Development	N	7	0	7	0	6	1
	%	100	---	100	---	85.7	14.3
Committee on Continuing Education	N	6	1	7	0	7	0
	%	85.7	14.3	100	---	100	---
Committee on Curriculum	N	11	0	11	1	12	0
	%	100	---	91.7	8.3	100	---
Committee on Faculty Affairs	N	6	1	5	2	5	2
	%	85.7	14.3	71.4	28.6	71.4	28.6
Committee on Libraries and Other Information Systems	N	6	0	5	2	6	1
	%	100	---	71.4	28.6	85.7	14.3
Committee on Research and Graduate Study	N	7	0	7	0	8	0
	%	100	---	100	---	100	---
Committee on Resident Instruction	N	11	2	10	1	10	2
	%	84.6	15.4	90.9	9.1	83.4	16.6
Committee on Undergraduate Student Affairs	N	3	2	5	2	6	1
	%	60.0	40.0	71.4	28.6	85.7	14.3
Total Committee Members	N	80	7	77	8	81	9
	%	92.0	8.0	90.6	9.4	90.0	10.0

TABLE 3

Sex of Senate Committee Officers*
for 1967-68, to 1969-70

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
YEAR	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
1967-68	16	94.1	1	5.9	17	100
1968-69	18	90.0	2	10.0	20	100
1969-70	17	85.0	3	15.0	20	100

*Committee Officers are the chairman and vice-chairman.

TABLE 4

Academic Rank* of Penn State Faculty
Compared with Academic Senate Members, Committee Members
and Committee Officers** for 1967-68, 1968-69, 1969-70

Rank	Total Faculty		Senate Members		Committee Members		Committee Chairman	
			1967-68					
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Professor	507	29.7	140"	66.0	59'	69.4	14	82
Associate Professor	488	28.6	51"	24.1	18	4.2	2	11.8
Assistant Professor	710	41.6	21	9.9	8	9.4	1	5.8
TOTAL	1705		212*		85		17	
			1968-69					
Professor	522	27.8	139'	63.8	48'	55.2	15	75.0
Associate Professor	564	30.1	56"	25.7	26'	29.9	4	20.0
Assistant Professor	791	42.1	23'	10.5	13'	14.9	1	5.0
TOTAL	1877		218*		87		20	
			1969-70					
Professor	583	27.6	135'	57.9	53	58.9	17	85.0
Associate Professor	655	31.0	63"	27.1	24	26.7	2	10.0
Assistant Professor	874	41.4	35'	15.0	13	14.4	1	5.0
TOTAL	2774		233*		90		20	

*"No Rank" category omitted from all totals.
These were appointed and ex officio members.

**Committee officers are the chairman and vice-chairman.

TABLE 5

Mean Age of the Faculty Members of the Academic Senate, its Committees and Committee Officers* from 1967-68 to 1969-70

	1967-68			1968-69			1969-70		
	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Senate Total	219	480.0	8.3	225	48.2	8.3	245	47.2	8.6
Committee on Committee & Rules	16	49.8	7.5	14	47.6	7.7	16	47.9	7.9
AAAS	7	52.7	6.8	6	47.7	6.6	7	48.1	9.6
Committee on Academic Development	7	43.3	5.0	7	45.7	3.7	7	48.7	5.4
Continuing Education	7	60.9	307.0	7	44.1	7.7	7	44.0	6.9
Curriculum	11	46.7	7.0	12	44.4	9.0	12	46.3	8.7
Faculty Affairs	7	49.1	7.4	7	47.3	10.2	7	43.4	9.4
Library	6	46.7	7.8	7	42.0	7.9	7	41.3	4.8
Research & Graduate Study	7	40.6	2.3	7	38.4	3.3	8	45.2	7.4
Resident Instruction	13	49.1	8.0	11	45.6	7.6	12	47.8	7.9
Undergraduate Student Affairs	5	41.4	6.4	7	45.3	6.5	7	44.1	7.7
Committee Officers	17	48.6	6.7	20	46.0	6.6	20	46.2	6.8

*Committee officers are the chairman and vice-chairman.

TABLE 6

Mean Length of Service of Faculty Members of the Senate, its Committees, and Committee Officers* from 1967-68 to 1969-70

	1967-68			1968-69			1969-70		
	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Senate Total	219	13.4	9.0	225	13.3	8.4	245	13.3	8.4
Committee on Committee & Rules	16	17.2	8.6	14	18.6	10.1	16	16.7	9.6
AAAS	7	16.6	11.0	6	18.2	6.5	7	16.0	8.2
Committee on Academic Development	7	6.6	4.8	7	7.6	5.3	7	8.9	5.8
Continuing Education	7	25.7	8.1	7	11.3	5.6	7	13.0	5.4
Curriculum	11	12.1	7.4	12	9.2	5.0	12	9.8	5.5
Faculty Affairs	7	12.1	6.9	7	11.9	7.1	7	13.1	7.0
Library	6	10.7	4.7	7	9.1	5.5	7	7.7	4.0
Research & Graduate Study	7	10.7	5.6	7	8.3	4.9	8	12.5	4.9
Resident Instruction	13	14.2	9.2	11	14.6	9.7	12	12.5	8.2
Undergraduate Student Affairs	5	11.8	7.2	7	11.1	6.0	7	10.7	4.8
Committee Officers	17	13.1	9.2	20	13.8	6.8	20	12.0	7.0

*Committee officers are the chairman and vice-chairman.

TABLE 7

Administrative Responsibilities of Senate Members, Compared with Committee Members and Committee Officers* for 1967-68, 1968-69 and 1969-70

	Senate Members		Committee Members		Committee Officers	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
			1967-68			
None	119	54.3	51	59.3	5	29.4
University and Research Level	18	8.2	2	2.3	0	0
College Level	32	14.6	12	14.0	4	23.5
Department Level	44	20.1	20	23.2	8	47.1
Miscellaneous	6	2.7	1	1.2	0	0
TOTAL	219		86		17	
			1968-69			
None	131	58.2	59	69.4	13	65.0
University and Research Level	18	8.0	2	2.4	1	5.0
College Level	30	13.3	10	11.8	1	5.0
Department Level	38	16.9	14	16.5	5	25.0
Miscellaneous	8	3.6	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	225		85		20	
			1969-70			
None	149	60.8	60	66.7	10	50.0
University and Research Level	22	9.0	3	3.3	1	5.0
College Level	32	13.06	11	12.2	2	10.0
Department Level	34	13.9	16	17.8	7	35.0
Miscellaneous	8	3.27	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	245		90		20	

*Committee Officers are the chairman and vice-chairman.

TABLE 8

Voting Unit of Senate Members
Compared with Committee Members and Committee Officers*
For 1967-68

	Senate Members		Committee Members		Committee Officers*	
Voting Unit	N	%	N	%	N	%
Appointed/Ex Officio	34	15.5	3	3.5	0	0
Agriculture	25	11.4	5	5.8	2	11.8
Arts & Architecture	12	5.5	5	5.8	1	5.9
Business	10	4.6	7	8.1	0	0
Earth & Mineral Sciences	16	7.3	9	10.5	1	5.9
Education	14	6.4	7	8.1	2	11.8
Engineering	21	9.6	10	11.6	1	5.9
Health, Physical Education & Recreation	12	5.5	5	5.8	1	5.9
Human Development	11	5.0	8	9.3	1	5.9
Liberal Arts	23	10.5	9	10.5	3	17.6
Science	19	8.7	8	9.3	3	17.6
Commonwealth Campuses	19	8.7	7	8.1	1	5.9
Hershey Medical Center	3	1.4	3	3.5	1	5.9
TOTAL	219		86		17	

*Committee officers are the chairman and vice-chairman.

TABLE 9

Voting Unit of Senate Members
Compared with Committee Members and Committee Officers*
For 1968-69

	Senate Members		Committee Members		Committee Officers*	
Voting Unit	N	%	N	%	N	%
Appointed/Ex Officio	34	15.1	3	3.5	0	0
Agriculture	25	11.1	8	9.4	3	15.0
Arts and Architecture	12	5.3	6	7.1	0	0
Business	11	4.9	5	5.9	1	5.0
Earth & Mineral Sciences	14	6.2	7	8.2	2	10.0
Education	15	6.7	6	7.1	1	5.0
Engineering	21	9.3	6	7.1	2	10.0
Health, Physical Education & Recreation	11	4.9	8	9.4	2	10.0
Human Development	11	4.9	9	10.6	2	10.0
Liberal Arts	25	11.1	9	10.6	3	15.0
Science	19	8.4	8	9.4	3	15.0
Commonwealth Campuses	23	10.2	8	9.4	1	5.0
Hershey Medical Center	4	1.8	2	2.4	0	0
TOTAL	225		85		20	

*Committee officers are the chairman and vice-chairman.

TABLE 10

Voting Unit of Senate Members
Compared with Committee Members and Committee Officers*
For 1969-70

	Senate Members		Senate Committee		Committee Officers*	
Voting Unit	N	%	N	%	N	%
Appointed/Ex Officio	35	14.3	2	2.2	0	0
Agriculture	27	11.0	9	10.0	3	15.0
Arts & Architecture	12	4.9	7	7.8	0	0
Business	12	4.9	6	6.7	2	10.0
Earth & Mineral Sciences	14	5.7	6	6.7	2	10.0
Education	16	6.5	7	7.8	2	10.0
Engineering	22	9.0	7	7.8	4	20.0
Health, Physical Education & Recreation	13	5.3	7	7.8	1	5.0
Human Development	12	4.9	7	7.8	3	15.0
Liberal Arts	25	10.2	11	12.2	2	10.0
Science	21	8.6	10	11.1	1	5.0
Commonwealth Campuses	25	10.2	7	7.8	0	0
Hershey Medical Center	11	4.5	4	4.4	0	0
TOTAL	245		90		20	

*Committee officers are the chairman and vice-chairman.

APPENDIX B

Methodology

The data on which this report is based are derived from three separate sources: senate documents, empirical data on senate committee membership, and interviews. An analysis of senate minutes, bylaws and constitutions provided a basis on which to become acquainted with and understand the Academic Senate at The Pennsylvania State University. Other documents such as doctoral dissertations, speeches by the president and leaders of the senate and its committees provided additional information for this study. The analysis of such documents concentrated in the years 1966-67 through 1969-70, as this was the target period for the investigation.

In order to make judgments about the representative character of senate committees, data were gathered on the age, sex, academic rank, voting unit, administrative responsibility, and years of service at Penn State of committee members. Senate bylaws and minutes were consulted in order to ascertain the membership of each senate committee over this sample period. This information was obtained from campus directories and with the aid of the personnel department.

In order to supplement the documentary and committee analyses, approximately 30 indepth interviews with selected administrators

and leaders, both past and present, of the Academic Senate were conducted. The interviews were semi-structured attempts to gain insight and illuminate the fundamental problems confronting it at Penn State.

It is clear from this analysis that we claim to have had neither a representative group nor a sample of total senate membership. Rather, we chose to concentrate on people who actually participated actively in leadership roles, on committees and in other senate activities.

References

Academy for Educational Development, *State Planning for Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: 1969.

Adams, Richard P. "Tulane University: Faculty Participation in the Government of the University." *AAUP Bulletin*, 49 (1963): 221-225.

American Association of Higher Education. *Faculty Participation in Academic Governance*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1967.

Berdahl, Robert O. *Statewide Coordination of Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

Eckert, Ruth E. "Participation in University Policy-Making: A Second Look." *AAUP Bulletin*, 56 (1970): 308-314.

Eckert, Ruth E. "The Share of the Teaching Faculty in University Policy-Making." *AAUP Bulletin*, 45 (1959): 346-351.

Eley, Lynn W. "The University of California at Berkeley: Faculty Participation in the Government of the University." *AAUP Bulletin*, 50 (1964): 5-13.

Fitzgibbon, Russell H. *The Academic Senate of the University of California*. Berkeley: Office of the President, 1968.

Hitch, Charles. "Plans are Presented for Maintaining Integrity of the University and its Academic Programs." *University Bulletin*, 19, no. 2, 3 August 1970 : 5-10.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. "The Next Decade." *Research Reporter*, 5, no.1 (1970): 1 and 5-7.

Ikenberry, Stanley O. *Roles and Structures for Participation in Higher Education Governance: A Rationale*. Pennsylvania State University: Center for the Study of Higher Education, August, 1970.

Jones, Howard Vallance. "The State College of Iowa: Faculty Participation in the Government of the College." *AAUP Bulletin*, 52 (1966): 437-441.

Keeton, Morris. *Shared Authority on the Campus*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1971.

Lieberman, Myron. "Representational Systems in Higher Education." In *Employment Relations in Higher Education*, edited by Stanley Elam, and Michael Moskow, pp. 40-71. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa, 1969.

Livingston, John C. "Academic Senate Under Fire." In *Agony and Promise*, edited by G. Kerry Smith, pp. 161-172. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969.

McConnell, T.R. *The Redistribution of Power in Higher Education*. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1971.

McConnell, T.R. "The University and the State -- A Comparative Study." In *Campus and Capitol*, edited by John W. Minter, pp. 89-118. Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1966.

McConnell, T.R., and Mortimer, Kenneth P. *The Faculty in University Governance*. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1971.

Morrow, Glenn R. "The University of Pennsylvania: Faculty Participation in the Government of the University." *AAUP Bulletin*, 49 (1963): 114-122.

Mortimer, Kenneth P. "The Structure and Operation of Faculty Governance: Who Rules and How?" Paper Prepared for a workshop on Faculty Members and Campus Governance, 17 February 1971, Houston, Texas. Mimeographed.

O'Neil, Robert. "The Eclipse of Faculty Autonomy." Paper prepared for a workshop on Faculty Members and Campus Governance, 18 February 1971, Houston, Texas. Mimeographed.

NOTES ON THE AUTHORS

KENNETH P. MORTIMER is an Assistant Professor and Research Associate with the Center for the Study of Higher Education at Penn State. He received his Ph.D. in Higher Education from the University of California at Berkeley in 1969. He earned the M.B.A. degree in International Business from the Wharton Graduate School of the University of Pennsylvania in 1962 and his B.A. in English in 1960 from the same institution. While at Berkeley he served as a United States Office of Education Educational Research Fellow and later as Postgraduate Research Educator with the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education. Dr. Mortimer has published extensively on faculty participation in academic governance. He is co-author (with T. R. McConnell) of a monograph entitled *The Faculty in University Governance*, recently published by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at Berkeley.

DAVID W. LESLIE is a doctoral candidate and research assistant with the Center for the Study of Higher Education at Penn State. He expects to complete his degree in higher education in 1971. Mr. Leslie received the Ed.M. in School Psychology from Boston University in 1965 and the B.A. in Psychology from Drew University in 1964. He had served at different times as registrar, director of institutional research, assistant director of admissions, and residence hall director at Dean Junior College in Massachusetts prior to joining the Center staff. Mr. Leslie's dissertation compares faculty perceptions of the legitimacy of selected governance processes at nine public colleges and universities in Pennsylvania.

Center for the Study of Higher Education

The Pennsylvania State University

The Center for the Study of Higher Education at The Pennsylvania State University was authorized by the Board of Trustees in January 1969. Dr. G. Lester Anderson, its director, was appointed the following April. The present staff of the center numbers 23 individuals including four full-time researchers, three visiting researchers and a cadre of advanced graduate students and supporting staff.

The mission of the center is to study higher education as an area of scholarly inquiry and research. Its studies are designed not only to be relevant to the university and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, but also to colleges and universities throughout the nation. The immediate focus of the center's research falls into three broad areas--governance, graduate and professional education, and human service occupation programs in two-year colleges.

Research reports, monographs and position papers prepared by staff members of the center are distributed within the university and to other institutions of higher education on a limited basis. Inquiries should be addressed to the Center for the Study of Higher Education, 123 Willard Building, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802.

Selected Publications Available From The Center For The Study Of Higher Education

Monographs

Pennsylvania Community College Faculty -- Attitudes Toward Collective Negotiations, John W. Moore, and *Career Patterns and Educational Issues*, Robert A. Patterson, May 1971.

Institutional Self-Study at The Pennsylvania State University, Kenneth P. Mortimer and David W. Leslie (eds.), December 1970.

Numbered Reports

Centers and Institutes at The Pennsylvania State University: A Case Study, Mary M. Norman, March 1971, Report No. 9.

New Careers in Human Service: A Challenge to the Two-Year College (A Preliminary Report), Martha A. Burns, March 1971, Report No. 8.

The Academy and General Education, Stanley O. Ikenberry, December 1970, Report No. 7.

A Profile of Proliferating Institutes: A Study of Selected Characteristics of Institutes and Centers in 51 Land Grant Universities, Stanley O. Ikenberry, November 1970, Report No. 6.

Roles and Structures for Participation in Higher Education Governance: A Rationale, Stanley O. Ikenberry, August 1970, Report No. 5.

Higher Education and the Black Atypical Student, W. Frank Hull IV, February 1970, Report No. 4. (Out of Print).

Colloquy: A Student-Initiated Reform in Higher Education, W. Frank Hull IV, February 1970, Report No. 3. (Out of Print).

The Changing College Curriculum--Issues and Implications, G. Lester Anderson, and *Instructional Systems in Higher Education--Specifications for Individualization*, Stanley O. Ikenberry, January 1970, Report No. 2. (Out of Print).

The "Special Admission" Student and the College, W. Frank Hull IV, November 1969, Report No. 1. (Out of Print).

Occasional Reports

Academic Senates: Some Models with Background Material, G. Lester Anderson, Kenneth P. Mortimer, W. Frank Hull IV and David W. Leslie, March 1970. (Out of Print).

Some Considerations Involved in Changing the Male/Female Ratio at University Park, Harold G. Richard, June 1970. (Out of Print).

Conference Reports

The Second Annual Pennsylvania Conference on Post-Secondary Occupational Education, Angelo C. Gillie, June 1970.

Post-Secondary Occupational Education: An Overview and Strategies, Angelo C. Gillie, January 1970.

Bibliographies

Selected Bibliography on the Concept of Leadership, Robert R. Smedley, June 1970, Number 4. (Out of Print).

The Black Student in Higher Education: A Bibliography, W. Frank Hull IV, November 1969, Number 3.

Student Unrest on the American Campus: A Bibliography, David W. Leslie, November 1969, Number 2.

Selected Bibliography in Higher Education, G. Lester Anderson, September 1969, Number 1. (Out of Print).